

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE HISTORIC CONSERVATION BOARD

APRIL 24, 2000

The Historic Conservation Board met at 3:00 P.M., in the J. Martin Griesel Room, Centennial Plaza II, with Messrs. Bloomfield, Kreider, Raser, Senhauser and Mmes. Borys, Spraul-Schmidt, Sullebarger and Wallace present. Mr. Bloomfield and Mr. Dale were absent.

Mr. Senhauser reported that he, Mr. Bloomfield, Ms. Borys, Mr. Forwood and Ms. Kellam met at WLWT at 140 West 9th Street and looked at the proposed window configuration; the siting was approved. After the contractor provided color samples for the proposed windows, a desert sand shade was selected.

### **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, ZONING VARIANCE & DD APPROVAL, 635 MAIN STREET, MAIN STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Staff member Caroline Kellam summarized the staff report for the application of the Hathaway Stamp Company to install their existing sign at their new location just a few doors from the old location. The sign meets the guidelines for the historic district; as proposed, it does not meet the Downtown Development sign guidelines. Variances are needed for clearance above grade and for size.

Mr. Larry Schultz, owner of the business, and Mr. Dan Wiggins, representing the sign company, were present to answer questions.

### **BOARD ACTION**

After discussing the issues, the Board voted unanimously (motion by Sullebarger, second by Raser) to:

1. Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of the proposed projecting sign with the condition that the sign be restored prior to installation. Restoration shall include fixing or replacing any damaged neon, repairing structural damage and repainting the sign, providing:
  - a. All conditions stipulated in 1442-507 of the Zoning Code outlined are met.
  - b. The sign be moved to the northernmost building pilaster and be installed so that the minimum sidewalk clearance is 12 feet 6 inches.
  - c. The variance for use of this sign, as for any other conditional use, applies only to the business (Hathaway Stamp Co.), not the building. Application for any changes of the sign for future tenants must return to the HCB for review.
2. Grant a variance from the strict application of the Downtown Development Regulations set forth in 1443-409 (a) to permit the installation of a projecting sign as described above, finding that such relief from the literal implication of the Zoning Code:
  - a. Is necessary and appropriate in the interest of historic conservation so as not to adversely affect the historic architectural or aesthetic integrity of the district; and

- b. Will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare or injurious to the property in the district or vicinity where the property is located.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS & ZONING VARIANCE, 1614  
BROADWAY STREET, PROSPECT HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Staff member Caroline Kellam distributed drawings and photographs and summarized the staff report on the proposed plan to construct a 7-foot high wood privacy fence and brick arched entryway with a 7-foot high wrought iron gate at the pedestrian entrance to the property. Both fence and gate require height variances.

No one attended the pre-hearing on March 10, 2000. Guidelines for the Prospect Hill Historic District do not address issues regarding details for rear and side yard fences. Overall, the proposal meets the guidelines. The proposed variance will provide privacy, better security and containment of pets.

Mr. John Whedon, the property owner, was available to answer questions. He said he intends to stagger the fence to accommodate the rugged topography. Mr. Senhauser pointed out that by varying the height of the fencing in relationship to the height of the retaining wall, a consistent seven-foot fence/retaining wall barrier would surround the property.

Ms. Borys suggested that the gate would be better defined if it were recessed 8-12 inches into the archway so the corner return is visible.

**BOARD ACTION**

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Borys, second by Spraul-Schmidt) to:

1. Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a wood privacy fence with no more than three changes in elevations and an 8-foot high new brick arch entry with a wrought iron gate recessed 8-12 inches behind the facade of the house.
2. Approve a conditional accessory use to allow the construction of the wood privacy fence and brick arch entryway at 1614 Broadway Street as per Section 1419-311 (b) finding that such relief from the literal implication of the Zoning Code:
  - a. Is necessary and appropriate in the interest of historic conservation so as not to adversely affect the historic architectural or aesthetic integrity of the district; and
  - b. Will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare or injurious to the property in the district or vicinity where the property is located.

A request to hear Item 4 of the agenda before Item 3 was denied because of an objection from a witness attending the hearing to testify about Item 3.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AND ZONING VARIANCE, 1883  
MADISON ROAD, EAST WALNUT HILLS HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Staff member Caroline Kellam distributed plans, elevations, maps, drawings, photographs, pertinent sections of the East Walnut Hills Historic Guidelines and summarized the application of Christopher J. Kepes, architect, and Tim and Peg Mathile, owners, to

1. Construct a three-car, one and a half story garage with a breezeway connector to the main house and
2. Construct a new driveway off Keys Crescent.

This project came to the Board on February 7, 2000 for a preliminary design review.. Although it is not characteristic of the neighborhood to have garages near a front elevation or as an extension off the side, there was little discussion of any other location for the garage at that review. The residence at 1883 Madison Road faces Madison Road but has frontage only on Keys Crescent. Ms. Kellam explained that, according to the City Zoning Department, the front yard is on the Keys Crescent side of the house; the yard in front of the main entrance on the Madison Road side is a side yard; the yard where the current driveway off Madison Road lies and the garage addition is proposed is a rear yard. In her report, however, she refers to the Madison Road yard as the front yard of the house at 1883 Madison Road and the proposed site of the new garage and driveway as a side yard.

Several neighbors attended a pre-hearing. Since December 1999 there have been meetings with architects, property owners, neighbors, attorneys for both sides and the Urban Conservator to address concerns and issues raised by owners of adjacent properties about the proposed addition. These concerns include the obstruction of existing views and the loss of open space as well as the concerns enumerated in the staff report.

Staff has reviewed the project and presented a report based on Board comments at the preliminary design review and the historic district guidelines that apply to new construction, additions, site improvements, driveways and paving. Legal issues of easements and driveways (of concern to the neighbors) were not addressed.

The proposed brick garage will require a zoning variance to be placed 13-feet from the property line. The building will be 25-feet wide by 40-feet deep and 24-feet to the roof peak. The Board's earlier suggestion to move the breezeway further from the house and enter the house from the breezeway through the easternmost opening on the front facade is incorporated into this proposal. The only alteration to the house will be converting the first-floor corner window opening into a door. The garage height and footprint will partially obstruct the view from the second-floor windows, but there will be no alteration to the second floor windows. The materials--wood, copper, brick--all meet the historic guidelines and are compatible with the main house.

The proposed driveway from Keys Crescent is in an appropriate location and winds around to accommodate the slope and elevation of the property. Three trees must be removed to accommodate the new driveway and garage.

Staff finds the construction of the driveway and the garage meets the guidelines for the historic district; the massing and scale of the garage does not overwhelm the house; the connection of the garage minimizes alteration to the house; the proposed driveway route minimizes the number of trees that must be removed. Therefore, staff recommends the Board approve a Certificate of Appropriateness and zoning variance as outlined in the staff report with the conditions enumerated in the report.

Staff has no final drawings for the breezeway. Drawings for the extensive landscaping, the construction of the new driveway and landscaping around the new garage addition will be required for staff review.

Other work and restoration of the main house reviewed in the preliminary design review, such as the removal of a glass atrium and existing deck, is not included in this proposal. The Board must review these separately at a later date. Staff recommends that, as a condition of approval by the Board of a Certificate of Appropriateness, the Board review any other work such as design of the new atrium, removal and replacement of decks and other restoration to the exterior of the main house prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness. Therefore, the project as a whole will be reviewed by the Board. This will prevent permits being issued in segments for portions of work.

Ms. Sullebarger asked whether the conditions mentioned in a letter from George Columbel attached to the report have been met. He asked for a detail drawing of the location, borders on the driveway and the old driveway be given up.

Ms. Kellam said the applicants would no longer use the present shared driveway but that staff did not address the issues of covenants, easements for the driveway, etc., because staff understands that the property owners are drafting an agreement among themselves.

Ms. Sullebarger expressed concern that damage to the trees be minimized by moving the driveway as far as possible from the trees.

Mr. Christopher Kepes and Mr. Frederick Koehler of Architects Plus were available to answer questions. After consulting with Steve Smith, landscape architect, they have designed the proposed driveway to preserve as many of the specimen trees as possible.

Ms. Sullebarger asked about the compatibility of the existing house roof and the garage roof. Mr. Kepes responded that he has no photographs, but the original drawings of the house show a barrel tile of the same type on the existing carriage house. The owner plans to install this same tile on the new garage and on the roof of the existing house.

Ms. Sullebarger moved to accept the staff recommendation; Mr. Raser seconded the motion. Mr. Senhauser then called upon those who had registered to speak in favor of the motion.

C. Francis Barrett, Esq., introduced himself, Timothy. and Margaret Mathile (the property owners) and the representatives of the property owners, Mr. Christopher Kepes, and Mr. Frederick Koehler of Architects Plus (the architects). He summarized the background of this application and spoke in favor of the motion. Mr. Barrett said:

We concur wholeheartedly with the staff report and all their conditions. They [the owners] will have to come back for approval on the house itself; the architects wanted to be sure before they embarked on that that the garage location design was acceptable to your Board. We fully agree with the approach the staff has taken. We should come back when we're ready with all the details of the house. The porches have to be redone. A lot of work bringing this house up to the quality it deserves will be undertaken, and Mr. Kepes will explain that.

Then he made these points:

1. The owners have agreed to the following conditions:
  - A) Access from 1883 Madison Road will be from Keys Crescent, not Madison Road.
  - B) Detailed landscaping plans will be provided by the applicant. Mr. Steve Smith, landscape architect, will prepare landscape plans and make them available to the neighbors' architect and the Urban Conservator for extensive review.
2. The architects have tried to make this fully compatible with the guidelines. Mr. Barrett explained that the front yard of the house is on Keys Crescent although the house faces toward Madison Road; therefore, the rear yard is in effect the side yard; what is practically the side yard is technically the rear yard. The setback for a side yard is 10-feet; for a rear yard it is 30 to 35-feet. He explained that a variance is needed because the 13 foot setback from the property line that is technically the rear property line but actually the side yard will exceed the 10 foot minimum for a side yard setback but is not enough for a rear yard setback.

Mr. Kepes explained he had met in February and March with the HCB, HCB staff and the neighbors who expressed concern about the garage size and proximity to the property lines, the architects reduced the size from a four-car to a three-car garage and pulled it away from the property lines and the house. The entrance to the house from the breezeway was moved into an existing window opening. In April the owners and their representatives met with the East Walnut Hills Assembly; at a preliminary review meeting there was an agreement between the Mathiles and the neighbors on the project.

Referring to Dr. Columbel's letter, Mr. Senhauser raised the issue of the variance requested for the garage setbacks from the property lines; Mr. Barrett responded that the property has been surveyed; the minimum setback is 13-feet from the nearest corner. Two concerns at the pre-hearings were that

- 1) the ridge line of the garage roof should not exceed the height of the top of the house's second floor windows. [Mr. Barrett said this has been included in the plans.]

- 2) the garage gutter line up with the gutter line of the balcony over the front door. [Mr. Barrett said this has also been confirmed.]

In his letter, Dr. Columbel also, expressed concern about the use of the 13-foot space behind the garage and the vacation of the easement on the current driveway.

Mr. Barrett reiterated that the owners are willing to accept as conditions of approval that

1. the current access from the common driveway be abandoned and
2. the landscaping plans are approved by the Urban Conservator.

Ms. Wallace asked who attended the March meeting with the neighbors. Mr. Barrett named Suzanne Skidmore, Tim Kane, Bill Hahn and George Columbel.

Subsequently, the owners met with Tom Puhn, the neighbor whose property is most affected visually by the project, and have a letter of support from him. Mr. Koehler described landscaping plans for the area adjoining the driveway and explained the lot topography. He said the only suitable location for the garage is where it is planned, and acknowledged that the location is not perfect.

Mr. Koehler pointed out that the entire breezeway is an element that does not mimic the main building; it has different elements such as materials, a standing-seam copper roof, largely frame construction and French doors across the face. No guardrail is planned on top of the driveway retaining wall; if Code requires one, it will probably be wrought iron.

Ms. Dorothea Kennedy, a member of the East Walnut Hills Assembly, stated the Assembly's support of the historic guidelines for the area that has been so well preserved over the years.

Mr. Mike Meretta, the owner of the carriage house at 1883 Keys Crescent, had said before he left the hearing that he favored the motion.

Ms. Dorothy Vogt, president of the East Walnut Hills Assembly and who spoke against the motion, asked whether the Board had had time to read the Assembly's letter. Board members said they had. She wondered why scale drawings are not available. Mr. Senhauser explained that the site plan and elevations say they are to scale. Ms. Vogt commented that she has never seen an older home with an original, attached garage. She said the district has done so well for so long and has neighborhood support.

Ms. Sullebarger asked Ms. Vogt whether older houses with attached garages are common in the district. Ms. Vogt said, "No, all that I have seen are detached."

Chuck Shroer, Esq., introduced himself, Ms. Suzanne Skidmore and Mr. Donald Beck; he presented background information and stated his clients' basis for their opposition to the garage:

1. It is inconsistent with the historic guidelines.

2. It places a garage in front of the house. In East Walnut Hills garages are to the rear or side.
3. The houses of Dr. George Columbel, Ms. Skidmore and the Mathiles were built as a family compound and all share a common vista. He distributed sketches indicating the intrusion of the proposed garage into the sight lines from the Columbel and Skidmore residences.

He summarized a letter and report from Fred Mitchell, architectural historian, stating that the placement of the garage in front of the house "will interject a new element that negates the historical visual linkage and relationships that were established with the original construction and open space arrangement of the main and immediate surrounding buildings." He continued that "the design and overall scale will have an adverse impact, and the sense of historical architectural consciousness affirmed by the visual relationship between the various buildings will be greatly diminished by the new construction."

Mr. Schroer stated that Ms. Skidmore and Dr. Columbel must landscape their property to avoid looking at the rear of a garage; they cannot do that until the easement is legally abandoned. If the applicant were to reconnect to the common driveway at a later date, the new landscaping will be destroyed. He pointed out that the severance of the connection to the common driveway is not an abandonment; if the driveway is to be abandoned, it must be legally abandoned.

He stated that his clients must be assured that the rear of the garage and portions beyond it remain as a green belt to be used solely as landscaping and that parts of the existing driveway will not be put back into use for parking or for mechanical equipment. He then distributed pictures of garages in the neighborhood placed to the side or rear of the main dwelling.

Mr. Donald Beck, architect, representing the neighboring property, stated the Historic Conservation Board is empowered to preserve the historic integrity of this district and its important homes, not just to consider a zoning variance. He said that the proposed garage will be in what is historically the front of the house. The important precedent that is set by allowing a garage in front of a contributing building in the historic district, whatever the setback is, must be considered very carefully. He finds the garage doors on the front of the house especially inappropriate.

Mr. Shroer said that at the pre-hearing his clients did not request that the height of the garage be no more than the second floor window [as stated by Mr. Barrett]; they just asked what the garage height would be. He also stated that his clients do not believe full consideration has been given to Dr. Columbel's offer to give some land in his southwest corner to accommodate a garage.

Ms. Skidmore addressed the issue of the trees as shown in the site plan. She said some of the large trees are not shown but they are important to her view and that of other neighbors. She also expressed concern that the heated driveway and site work required to install it would adversely affect the trees. She expressed her support for the historic district.

Mr. Beck reiterated the importance of the

- 1) historic precedent of a garage at the front of the house,
- 2) the access to the Madison Road drive and
- 3) the landscaping at the rear of the garage and maintenance of this as a green space.

Ms. Sullebarger asked Mr. Beck if there are cases in which garages or carriage houses are treated as part of an entry court at the front of the house, similar to one at Peterloon; Mr. Beck responded that there are. He said that the question in this case is whether it should be allowed in this district because it is not typical; he stated that if it is allowed, there should be some strong, legally binding controls for the protection of the neighbors.

Ms. Sullebarger asked Mr. Schroer whether his clients will accept construction of the garage with the conditions that are being proposed or if the clients are completely opposed to the construction.

Mr. Schroer said, "We'll accept that garage. The conditions in the [proposed] Certificate of Appropriateness are not satisfactory. It doesn't address the abandonment of that driveway, and when I mean abandon, I, Ms. Skidmore, Dr. Columbel, other consultants that I've talked to, the architectural preservationists, the architects, the real estate brokers, the listing agents familiar with this community, say that driveway has to be legally abandoned in the Court House so that landscaping can occur on the west side of the property line without fear of someone coming back to the Board or some other means within the City permitting process to reconnect the driveway. The second thing is, call it a landscape easement, call it a restrictive covenant, we want to know that that's greenbelt behind the garage and extending somewhat either way." He emphasized that his client does not want cars parked there, mechanical equipment installed or the driveway reconnected, as is articulated in Dr. Columbel's letter.

Ms. Sullebarger asked whether there had been discussion between the applicant and the neighbors over the two issues of giving up the easement on the driveway and granting a covenant for the protection of the land behind the garage. Mr. Schroer responded that these had been discussed but are unacceptable to the applicant and their attorney.

Ms. Skidmore said she and the applicant have been negotiating this issue since February. She has consistently maintained that, although she does not like the plan, she would go along with it if good landscaping is installed and the driveway access to Madison Road is legally abandoned. She said that until last Wednesday she thought this had been agreed upon.

Mr. Kreider asked the location of the area Dr. Columbel is offering to donate as a garage site. Ms. Skidmore showed on the site plan how this would permit the new garage to be clustered into the back corners of the lots with other garages.



When asked about the feasibility of this location from the design standpoint, Mr. Kepes said he knows there is a steep grade that would require a retaining wall and the driveway would come in at a lower grade; he has not studied this for cost feasibility, etc. Ms. Skidmore added that Dr. Columbel is willing to agree with the location under the conditions Mr. Schroer presented. Other alternatives to a 3-car garage, such as a 2-car garage on the kitchen side of the house and a second 2-car garage on the side, have also been explored.

Mr. Schroer reminded the Board that construction of a garage that would extend into Dr. Columbel's yard would be a lot split between landowners and would not require subdivision approval.

Mr. Paul Sittenfeld of 1854 Keys Crescent spoke against the proposal. He suggested that one of the reasons the neighborhood has not shown more concern about this project is confusion about the actual location of the proposed driveway. He said the first notice he received about this issue was about April 15, 2000 for a proposed driveway off Beechcrest Lane. He stated Beechcrest Lane is about two blocks away and is an unlikely site for a driveway to 1883 Madison Road

Mr. Sittenfeld explained that in the past, twenty or more mature trees were removed from the yard of the former carriage house now owned by Mr. Maretta, causing earth slides and flooding on Stevenson Lane. He also spoke of the history associated with the residents of this group of homes. He pointed out that the people who purchased these homes understood they are accepting limitations such as no garages because the homes were built prior to the frequent use of automobiles. He expressed concern about setting a precedent for adding garages.

Mr. Sittenfeld stated that as a former trustee of Peterloon and a property owner within the East Walnut Hills Historic District, he knows Peterloon has no contiguous garage.

Ms. Susan Haas, realtor and a resident of East Walnut Hills, spoke against the variance because of the garage size and mass, its position in the sight line of a neighbor and concern that application to the Historic Conservation Board is perceived as a way to circumvent the zoning code.

Mr. Barrett stated that approval to build a garage was a contract contingency when the Mathiles bought 1833 Madison Road. After meeting with the neighbors and the Historic Conservation office staff and appearing before the Historic Conservation Board, everything seemed to be in place for a garage; so the Mathiles waived that condition and closed.

Mr. Barrett said that there is almost no landscaping between the Mathile house and the Columbel-Hahn House; there is thicker foliage between the Mathile house and the Skidmore house. He emphasized that his clients will accept two conditions to the Certificate of Appropriateness:

1. Legally abandoning access to Madison Road
2. Landscaping on the east side of the property.

Any change in that would require a new Certificate of Appropriateness, public hearings, etc. Mr. Barrett said his clients did offer to release the easement to Madison Road so long as the garage exists; this easement would be of record. He stated his clients cannot agree that neighbors have an easement over their property with controls on their property; that affects the resale of the property, value, marketability, etc. and is overreaching. He stated his clients are willing to accept the conditions about landscaping. Mr. Mathile has offered to pay for extensive landscaping of the owner's choice on the Skidmore and Columbel properties. He pointed out the setback on the Columbel property is extensive and the Skidmore garage is really in the front yard.

Mr. Barrett summarized that his client believes this project

1. Has been reviewed extensively
2. Does meet the guidelines
3. Includes extensive landscaping
4. Impacts the view from the east only minimally.

He said there are other garages, such as the Skidmores' and others in East Walnut Hills, in the front yard, and the very irregularity of the property and siting of buildings, orientation of the homes, etc. in East Walnut Hills adds to its attractiveness. The garage in the Mathiles plan is in proportion to and compatible with the house and seems most appropriate.

Mr. Senhauser asked Mr. Barrett if his clients would be willing to abandon legally their current easement to the Madison Road driveway. Mr. Barrett said his clients are willing to abandon legally the current easement, as long as their proposed garage exists.

Ms. Sullebarger asked if there would be a way to recover the easement if the garage were removed. Mr. Barrett said that if the garage were removed, that would remove the objection to the Madison Road access. He said his clients are willing to accept the condition be recorded as a Release of Easement that there will be no rights of ingress and egress [to Madison Road] so long as the garage stands.

Responding to Ms. Skidmore's statement that some existing trees are not shown on the site plan, Mr. Koehler said every tree standing on the property is shown on the site plan. He explained there is not room to get a garage between the house and the former carriage house owned by Mr. Mareta. He listed several garages in the neighborhood, both attached and detached [houses at the corner of Dexter and Wold, Madison and Wold, and Keys Crescent Lane] that his firm has designed and stated there is a precedent for this project; some of the garages face the street.

Mr. Schroer stated the applicant's proposal to resume the use of the easement for the driveway to Madison Road when the garage is no longer there was tendered to his client only minutes earlier; there has been no opportunity to address it.

Mr. Kreider expressed his concern that the front yard of the Mathile house, for the purposes of the guidelines, is on Madison Road. He said alternatives to a garage in the front yard in a neighborhood where the prevailing pattern is garages in rear

yards or clustered with other garages at a corner of properties has not been fully explored. He thinks the Columbel offer to deed property and cluster the garage with his garage is a better alternative than what has been presented. Mr. Kreider said he did not think a garage on the south side would be too close to the Mareta house and that he thinks that other alternatives have not been thoroughly explored.

Mr. Senhauser explained that if the garage met all the setback requirements there would be no zoning issue. This is, however, an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness under historic guidelines, and historically the front has been on Madison Road.

Mr. Raser said the view line issue would be worse if the garage were put on the south.

Ms. Sullebarger said she regrets the subdivision of the carriage house away from the 1883 Madison Road property and what that has set in motion here today. Most of the neighborhood houses were built before garages, but this is an amenity owners now want. She and some of the Cincinnati Preservation Association Trustees toured the site and concluded the topography makes the proposed site the most feasible one. She stated the proposed garage is architecturally compatible with the original house in terms of scale, material, design and roofline; she is pleased to hear plans to restore the roof to clay tile. She commented that the offset entrance, unusual in a Georgian house, makes her wonder whether the house was built all at once. She said the placement of the garage, although it is on the front, does not disturb the dominance of the front entrance or interfere with that configuration.

Ms. Sullebarger suggested that the people most affected by this, the Skidmore-Kane and Columbel-Hahn families, are willing to accept this design with these conditions:

1. The Matiles give up the easement to the shared drive,
2. Make a legal commitment that there will be only landscaping on the east of the garage,
3. Entertain landscaping on the Skidmore and Columbel properties at the Matiles' expense and
4. The east facade of the garage is detailed with windows to resemble the wall of a house.

#### **BOARD ACTION**

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Sullebarger, second by Kreider) to table consideration of the application until there can be further consultation between the owners and the neighbors to reach a compromise upon the conditions of the granting of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

#### **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS AND ZONING VARIANCE, 325 TUSCULUM AVENUE, COLUMBIA-TUSCULUM HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Staff member Dan Young summarized the staff report on the application to demolish an existing garage and construct a new, larger garage. The garage was probably built the house. The owner, Mr. Barron Niehaus was present to answer questions.

In reply to a question by Mr. Raser, Mr. Young said the new garage walls at the property line will be where the existing garage walls are. The City Buildings and Inspections Department has led the applicant to understand that the placement of the building is sufficient for their needs. Buildings and Inspections has requested rafter details.

The applicant agreed to Ms. Sullebarger's suggestions that the window on the side of the elevation be a six-over-six like the existing, rather than a four-over-four as shown on the plan and that the roof pitch be steeper, similar to the main residence. The Historic Conservation Board will grant a height variance for the garage to permit this.

The applicant also agreed to paint or apply panels to the garage doors to resemble carriage house doors.

### **BOARD ACTION**

The Board voted unanimously (motion by Raser, second by Sullebarger) approve the staff recommendation to:

1. Grant the requested variance of Section 1469-124 (Replacements or Reconstructions) of the Cincinnati Zoning Code to permit the construction of the new larger garage on the site of the existing garage at 325 Tusculum Avenue, finding that the variance :
  - a) is necessary and appropriate in the interest of historic conservation so as not to adversely affect the historic architectural, or aesthetic integrity of the district; and
  - b) will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare or injurious to property in the district or vicinity where the property is located.
2. Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the existing garage at 325 Tusculum in the Columbia Tusculum Historic District and the construction of a larger replacement in the same location, on the condition that:
  - a) the detail of the eaves so they will not encroach on neighboring property
  - b) details from the main residence such as roof pitch, fish scaling, cornering and siding will be incorporated in the plans
  - c) the garage door be designed to resemble carriage house doors.
3. Grant a height variance for the roof to simulate the roof pitch of the existing residence.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

As there were no other items for consideration by the Board, the meeting adjourned (motion by Spraul-Schmidt, second by Raser).

---

William L. Forwood  
Urban Conservator

---

John C. Senhauser  
Chairman  
Date \_\_\_\_\_